

Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

130 East Twenty-second Street, New York City

Bulletin

VOL. X, No. 3

MARCH, 1931

* * * Founding a family is always an adventure. * * * life must always be full of risks. We may smile, therefore, when it is remarked that the future developments of the home are risky. Birds in the air and fishes in the sea, quite as much as our own ancestors on the earth, have always found life full of risks. It was the greatest risk of all when they insisted on continuing on the old outworn ways and so became extinct. If the home is an experiment and a risky experiment, one can only say that life is always like that."

—HAVELOCK ELLIS, "Little Essays of Love and Virtue."

INSTITUTION NEWS

At the Ohio Valley Regional Conference, Miss Esther McClain, of the Ohio Department of Public Welfare, discussed the development of case work service in institutions. The following excerpts are taken from Miss McClain's paper:

The significance of the institution's responsibility toward dependent childhood is realized when we know that to every child-placing agency in the United States there are three institutions. To affect the lives of child dependents in this country vitally, case work must be a part of the institution program.

Children's institutions in the last few years have in many communities made more progress than the child-placing agencies, we are told by those who have a nation-wide point of view. If the institutions in other States are like those in Ohio, the order of progress has been, first, improving plant and equipment; second, enriching the régime, and third, initiating a social case work program. We must remember, however, that the child-caring institutions have existed in this country for two hundred years and social case work is the product of a much later period. * * * *

Section IV of the recent White House Conference on Child Health and Protection included in its report the following statement: "All standards of child care rest upon two basic factors: (1) a trained and competent personnel, and (2) right methods of social work. All other considerations, such as plant, equipment and endowment, are of secondary importance." * * * *

The intake service alone will in some instances pay for the entire case work program. This was demonstrated recently by two Ohio institutions. One is a public institution with one trained social worker on the staff. The demands for admission are great. However, during her first year of work the superintendent and board found that through careful intake service and making other plans for certain children the case worker saved the institution \$3,806. That the children were not thereby neglected and their problems left unsolved was indicated by the fact that only one of these cases came back to the juvenile court or the institution for admission in the next year and a half. The other institution is a private children's institution responsible for 900 children. It has a large social service staff of thirteen workers, including three in the intake department. Only three years ago this same institution had no intake department and accepted children readily. Upon the basis of 1930 statistics, 35 per cent of those applying were accepted, whereas 65 per cent were found not in need of its services. * * * *

(Continued on page 3, column 2)

OHIO VALLEY REGIONAL CONFERENCE

HELD IN LOUISVILLE, FEBRUARY 26-28

From the standpoint of numbers, the Ohio Valley Regional Conference was not a great success, only 58 persons registering. Louisville and Indianapolis were the localities best represented. From the standpoint of program content and interest in topics presented, the conference was worth while, however, in spite of limited attendance.

At the dinner meeting on Friday, Robert W. Kelso, Director of the St. Louis Community Fund, spoke on "Elements of a Sound, Statewide Program of Public Welfare Service." The following summary gives the salient points in Mr. Kelso's interesting address:

In this country there is a steady growth of an appreciation of the science of government even though we are still so "green" at the job that we make many dismal failures.

In developing a social welfare program there are a number of fundamental principles to be considered. Some of these are as follows:

1. Charity and the need for social service, like crime, are local. Because the family is the basic unit of society the events leading up to a criminal act or the incidents which finally make social service necessary are not separable from the environment of the family itself. We need to see incidents and events in relation to environment if all local color is not to be taken out of the picture.

2. The planning of welfare work is beginning to be recognized as a problem of constructive engineering. It is essential to unify the planning of local units and the building of policies through the leadership of the

(Continued on page 4, column 2)

LIMITATIONS OF A CHILD PROTECTIVE PROGRAM

DOUGLAS P. FALCONER, Executive Secretary,
Children's Aid and S. P. C. C. of Erie County,
Buffalo, New York

Editor's Note:

The following paper was given by Mr. Falconer at the National Conference of Social Work in Boston. Because of questions which are being raised in many communities as to the place of a children's protective agency in a child welfare program, it seems worth while to print Mr. Falconer's paper as a corollary to Mr. Carstens' interpretation of the functions of a children's aid society which appeared in the February Bulletin.

In this paper I propose to devote my attention to the limitations of child protective work. The need for it is so generally recognized, and the time allotted so short, that this seems the wiser course. To be sure, there is no unanimity concerning the need for any one type of organization to do child protective work, and there are many communities where the field is largely neglected, but there are few, if any, students of child welfare who claim that the function is not necessary.

The limitations naturally fall into three main divisions: limitations from

- I. Organization standpoint
- II. Community standpoint
- III. Service itself

I. Organization Limitations

1. Our greatest limitation is to be found in our philosophy and general point of view. Historically child protection is a police, law-enforcing movement. Today we practice some, and talk more, of case work methods. But the heritage of the past is a heavy burden and we have not freed ourselves from it. I have been privileged to see the preliminary manuscript of the job analysis of the protective field, now being edited by Miss Williamson. She has studied the field as it now is and is attempting faithfully to picture its present practices, philosophy and tendencies. Such words as "rescue," "prosecute," "investigate," "evidence," "compel," are found in abundance, while "assist," "persuade," "development of resources," "treatment," are almost wholly absent.

In one place, when discussing the division of responsibility between the executive and the supervisors, she illustrates the prerogatives of the executive by quoting one leader that "permission to a worker to go armed" is exclusively his decision. If we could break away from this psychology of force, our most serious limitation would disappear.

2. The Milford Conference report stressed the importance of not separating diagnosis from treatment. Protective agencies are always great feeders of public child-caring departments and cannot carry out plans, no matter how carefully made. Being a distributing center involves great dangers to the real service of an organization. The protective agency, because of pres-

sure of work, necessarily has short time contacts. When a situation results in court action and removal of children, usually the commitment is made to a public department and, after a conference when recommendations are made, the protective agency withdraws. Constantly making suggestions for someone else to carry out has its dangers. The protective agency may lose touch with the realities of child care. Continued responsibility for the children is a sobering influence, and frequently results in better and more determined efforts to keep children in their own homes. So long as public agencies will receive all children from the protective agencies, the tendency toward better family case work will be handicapped.

3. Once the field of a protective agency is defined, limitation of intake is almost impossible.

4. The protective worker gets into nearly all fields of social case work; legal, medical, family, unmarried mothers, behavior problems, recreation, etc., and specialization is difficult, indeed impossible, unless the staff is a very large one.

II. Limitations from Community Standpoint

1. Physical cruelty, severe neglect, sex offense indeed a large part of the work of the child protective agencies is caused by the mental defect or abnormality of the parents. A study of those families that were repeatedly called to the attention of our organization in Buffalo revealed that mental defect or abnormality was found, by actual diagnosis, in 72 out of 130 families so studied. Our lack of community facilities of diagnosis and treatment for such persons is a great limitation to good child protective work. Many such families are not diagnosed, and much valuable energy is wasted attempting to establish and maintain standards of family life that are utterly impossible of accomplishment.

2. Child protective work is sharply limited by public opinion, and especially by the attitude and standards of judges, police officials, relief policies, etc. For example in Cleveland all outdoor relief is handled by the Associated Charities, with money supplied by the Community Fund. In times of depression and unemployment the demands for relief are so great that other services, financed by the Community Fund, are limited. In Detroit there is no private money put into relief. The Public Welfare Department of the city handles the entire problem. There is no private family welfare organization of any size or strength. This forces an additional load of family case work on the children's societies.

My city is a border one, and its political leadership has largely been wet. The law forbids children under sixteen to attend movies, dance halls, pool rooms, etc., unless accompanied by parents or guardians. When public opinion supports the organization in its efforts at law enforcement its effectiveness is substantially maintained.

To bring an intemperate husband and father before a judge who is also intemperate is a good deal of a farce. To attempt a judicial review of an illicit marital situation before a judge whose personal standards of morality are notorious is equally ineffective. In other words, the protective agency can hope to establish only those standards which are generally accepted and practiced by the community.

When public opinion is perhaps the most important step to be taken. If the sentiment of the group is in favor of early marriage, legal prohibition will probably be ineffective, and may be very pernicious.

3. The private protective agency should not attempt to occupy a larger field than it can adequately cover with case work service. Its only hope to meet this standard is in the definition of its field. Once decision is made to handle rape, physical cruelty, medical neglect, or any of the other child protective problems, it is usually impossible to limit the number of cases accepted. The organization has to meet the need, maintaining such standards as are possible. Here is found the stock alibi for not doing better work. All such agencies should, from time to time, review their fields of operations, and if they find adequate standards cannot be maintained, they should drop certain activities. We should all insist that the private protective agency do well whatever it undertakes. Continued sub-standard work is a poor contribution to child welfare.

III. Limitations of the Service Itself

1. Child protective agencies deal frequently with urgent and critical situations, in which speed is necessary. Time, one of the most valuable assets of case work, is frequently lacking. Sometimes this results in gathering considerable valuable information about a family, but no time is found to evaluate and interpret it, and its value is dissipated. Sometimes, too often, it results in "hitting the high spots" in an investigation, and too great a reliance on intuitive understanding of what it is all about. Sometimes it results in inexcusably sloppy and superficial work. It is certainly a large limitation.

2. The very fact that critical situations exist makes for emotional attitudes on the part of interested parties, physicians, clergymen, relatives, employers, etc. These are likely to result in a bias in the worker, instead of that impersonal objectivity which is so sorely needed. "Righteous indignation" over the suffering of childhood has a proper place, but it is likely to spill over into areas where it becomes a menace to service. It is difficult not to become emotionally engaged when dramatic and, at times, fearful things are happening, and yet the greater the drama the more urgent is the need for calm, quiet thinking. We are limited by our lack of emotional control.

3. The critical nature of the work may, and often does, result in too much concentration on the abuses in the situation. The personalities of the individual children are overlooked. Many records of neglected children are utterly indistinguishable from each other, though the children are by no means so much alike. Mass treatment with all its weaknesses results.

Turning for a moment to the limitations of our treatment of community conditions, as against our case work restrictions, there are several factors worth thinking about.

1. We are not sufficiently sensitive to what is happening to children. Old abuses have been pointed out to us by early pioneers. But the changing conditions of our

life are constantly bringing new dangers to children, many of which we do not recognize. For example, how sensitive are we to the effects of the constant and unregulated attendance of young children at the movies?

2. At times we lack the courage to tackle some of the real problems. This is likely to be true of those situations where substantial economic interests are involved. To bear truthful witness to community needs sometimes calls for courage of a high order. Real service to children in this field should be classified as extra hazardous, and it is a reflection upon us if we make it entirely safe.

3. Our technique for improving and strengthening public administration is lacking in vision and finesse. Too often we say that public officials are political appointees, and hopeless in the social work field. That this is not true even casual study will demonstrate, and the failure of social workers to win the respect, confidence, and cooperation of public officials is largely our own fault. Too often we have attempted to superimpose our ideas and point of view on a public department, and when there is resistance or difficulty we are prone to shrug our shoulders and walk away. We would be equally resistant to any such approach.

4. Our program of interpretation to the public is hardly begun. We have important tasks to perform, which largely depend for their success on public understanding and sympathy. We may well devote considerable time and energy to carrying our public with us. Unless we do, our usefulness will be sharply limited.

These are by no means all of the limitations, but they seem to me among the most important. In spite of them, however, I believe that child protective work has made substantial progress, and that during the next decade we will be so much more imaginative in our service that the very real tragedies in American child life will be sharply reduced. The work of the Child Welfare League of America, under Dr. Carstens' leadership, is having a great influence, and is only one of many encouraging factors.

INSTITUTION NEWS

(Continued)

Child-placing as part of the program of an institution can no longer be undertaken without case work service. If the unit is too small to provide such service it should be secured through an existing child-placing agency. The institution equipped with adequate social service can aspire to the new designation "child-developing" institution rather than "child-caring" institution. Diversification of program should mean studied choice of environment and type of treatment through the use of both group and family care. * * * *

Case work is so fundamental in any child-care program that it may well be considered not only the oil that lubricates but also the machinery that produces the goods. To the child, it means he is not a lone unit, but a part of a family to be dealt with; to the family it means, perhaps, new living, new hope; to the institution it means an integration of its work with the social forces

THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

President—CHENEY C. JONES, Boston
1st Vice-President—JACOB KEPECS, Chicago
2d Vice-President—MRS. LESSING J. ROSENWALD, Philadelphia
3d Vice-President—MISS RUTH TAYLOR, New York
Secretary—MISS JESSIE P. CONDIT, Newark
Treasurer—PAUL T. BEISSER, Baltimore
Executive Director—C. C. CARSTENS

This BULLETIN, published monthly (omitted in July and August).
 Annual subscription, \$1.00. Single copies, 10c.

and agencies in the community and State, and enlargement of its service to children. In direct proportion to the plans made for children and the shortening of the period of stay in the institution, the number of children aided increases. The institution that keeps children for several years, without a plan for them, is in a frozen or static state. * * * *

Case work strikes the death blow to the old argument of institution versus foster home by basing treatment on the needs of the individual child. Since most communities afford both resources, it requires case work to get maximum benefits from both. * * * *

Whether case work shall be done directly by an institution or contracted for with an existing case working agency is contingent upon many factors. Is the institution small or large, urban or rural? Do those in charge of the institution appreciate the value of case work and are their convictions and knowledge sufficient to warrant the employment of trained and successful social workers? Do the superintendent and board stand united on this or are they working at cross purposes? Is the family case working agency in the community well established and doing the quality of work that safeguards and keeps families together? Are trained and capable social workers available? * * * *

Sometimes a demonstration by a case working agency makes it possible to present to the officials of public units of institutional care strong arguments for providing their own service. In Ohio the demonstration method used by the State department has been instrumental in dramatizing the need for local service in several rural communities. It has not been as successful as hoped for, because of the limitation of personnel in the State department, but the plan has, perhaps, justified itself, since at least nine out of twenty-seven counties that now have their own social workers came to realize the need for them through this means. * * * *

We raise the question of the success of social service if there is not an appreciation of its value by the institution board and superintendent. It is sometimes difficult for them to see, unless the superintendent is a social worker himself and interprets the needs all along the way. As Nietzsche says, "The good generally displeases us when it is beyond our ken." * * * Sometimes the institution acquires inexperienced social work of a grade inferior to that of other case working agencies in the community and trouble follows. In these cases, the institution at first feels it has what it has not and later, when serious problems arise in regard to the handling of children's problems, the whole idea

of social case work may be repudiated by the institution. The hardest job is bringing a realization of the need and a desire for skillful service. Since "seeing is believing," the best way around this, perhaps, is through the demonstration method. Engaging the temporary services of a trained worker, or workers, has sometimes been the golden key to reveal hidden social resources. What at first sight appeared to be poor family groupings. This builds up strong convictions in the minds of institution officials in a way that is not otherwise possible. * * * *

The work of the other social agencies in a community seriously affects the institution's own program. Without out effective, well supported family case work as a bulwark to strengthen otherwise disintegrating family life, the court and the public institution can become a dependency mill in which the children of unnecessarily broken homes are ground. * * * *

In Ohio our 57 public institutions and 10 child welfare boards doubled the amount spent for social service in two years. They seem to be moving slowly toward realization that the institution has other obligations to children than just child care. In ten years, in the same county institutions and organizations, the number of social workers has increased from five to thirty-nine, and the number of institutions and agencies using boarding homes has increased from two to fifty. The rapid development of the latter brings up grave questions of standards in child-placing. Without adequate social service, boarding out is dangerous and should not be done.

Whether an institution secures its own worker or combines with another institution for this service, it arranges for it through an existing case working agency is secondary to the more important accomplishment of getting it. A central intake bureau for a group of institutions has its merits and also its inherent weaknesses. Some think this plan is better considered as a demonstration with the institutions encouraged to secure their own workers eventually; others consider the central intake a great economy and a control over the securing of a trained staff. Much has been said and written supporting both of these views.

The end results for the children, provided there is skillful social service and reasonable case loads, should be the same. Each of us, interested in institutions and the work they can do, needs to look about in our respective communities for the best ways and means.

OHIO VALLEY REGIONAL CONFERENCE

(Continued from page 1)

largest unit of government, namely, the State. The modern State cannot operate without a State department of public welfare with which all county units of welfare will be hooked up. The enactment of equalization measures by means of which poorer communities may be aided in their development is one of the methods by which a State may truly become a commonwealth.

3. People who mean something to their own communities and to the State should serve on boards and should be selected because qualified to act as mouthpieces

institutions of public welfare rather than as loud speakers for political parties.

4. Some social problems are so technical and so homogeneous that it is preferable to provide treatment facilities by combining resources under State leadership. The care of the insane, the feeble-minded and the delinquent is a logical function for the State to assume.

5. State supervision of private social work is of basic importance and a necessity of the future.

6. No one "prescription" for the development of social programs should be prescribed for all communities, as there is still considerable heterogeneity in counties and municipalities. The State department should set up certain principles and outline methods as part of its unification program, but unification does not connote inflexibility and stifling of local initiative.

Bad as government may be, we cannot leave government out of the problem of social welfare. This does not mean that there is not a real place for the private agency. In any scheme of social engineering the private agency will always be turned to as the "runner-up" and the experimenter. The "mentally revamped" private organization is also in a position to exert pressure which will tend to safeguard governmental units of social service against political interference as well as against the stultification which sometimes occurs in public departments.

At the Saturday morning session Dr. Frank O'Brien, Director of the Louisville Psychological Clinic, outlined psychiatric interests in the field of child care.

Dr. O'Brien emphasized the importance of seeing a child in terms of a complete human being and the necessity, therefore, of knowing all that there is to be known about him in terms of factual material. Gaps in such material are disconcerting to the psychiatrist who is attempting to treat a child. The history of both parents back one generation forms a background which illuminates the study of the child himself. Often this history is of more value than the actual study.

The important thing in life is the attitude one shows toward the experiences which come to each of us. Both external and internal forces play a rôle in fashioning the individual. While it is essential for the psychiatrist to know what has happened to a child and what the environmental factors in the situation are, he must also know what the child himself thinks about the external stimuli. How he responds to bad home conditions, to parents, to teachers, etc., must be determined before intelligent treatment can be planned.

In discussing placement of children who must be removed from their own homes, Dr. O'Brien stressed the following points:

1. When a child's own home fails him, the nearest and best substitute for it is a foster home.

2. A foster home has all the handicaps as to personality difficulties, wrong attitudes, instability, etc., which a child's own home may have plus the complicated problems which come up because of the artificial relationship.

3. The foster child brings more problems to the foster home than a natural child brings.

4. Because of these inherent problems in the foster home-foster child relationship skillful home-finding is a prerequisite to successful child-placing. The worker must go beyond the verbal or written statement of a family as to why a child is wanted and try to determine the psychiatric reasons why an application for a child has been made.

Too often, the real reasons do not come out until the child has failed to fill the bill. A long time should be spent in learning to know the prospective foster parents before a child is finally placed.

5. Institutional care is not a substitute for family life and should not be used as such. There is, however, a place in child welfare programs for intelligently directed institutions equipped to meet special needs.

6. Institutions have a somewhat more objective attitude toward their jobs because they do not have to worry about what the neighbors will think or how a foster child will affect a natural child in the foster family. However, the claim sometimes made that the executive of an institution has the people on his staff under such control that institutional care is free from the potential hazards existing in all foster families is an illusion.

7. Children are born with natural conflicts and they are continually trying to work out their own salvation. The rôle of the adult either in a natural home, a foster home or an institution should be chiefly that of spectator.

Too many people expect miracles of children, forgetting that they are evolving animals and not static personalities. The objective of child training is to stimulate the right inner responses rather than to secure mere external conformity.

Dr. E. C. Blom, of the Louisville Board of Education, and Mrs. Joseph Byers led the discussion which followed Dr. O'Brien's address. Mrs. Byers in urging that social workers approach the task of caring for children with an objective point of view repeated the warning which a psychiatrist with whom she once worked gave her, "Be careful what you are looking for—you might find it."

In a later edition of the BULLETIN we will carry the paper given by Dr. T. Cook Smith, a Louisville pediatrician, on the effects of an economic depression on child health.

THE PORTLAND STUDY

One of the most significant recent developments in the field of community organization for social work has been the growing realization by various communities of the desirability and necessity of sound program building.

Some cities which have entered the Chest field in the last decade have been content to concentrate their activities very largely on the money raising aspect of the situation with a minimum of attention directed toward the development of a sound and adequate program. These cities, many of which were apparently successful from year to year in raising their money, have discovered during the past year or two that this policy has not only brought growing dissatisfaction on the part of those interested in the program but has also made it increasingly difficult to raise the money.

Conversely, those communities which have given program development proper place in their plans have discovered that they had indeed planned wisely in that their communities have responded magnificently both in money and service during the present emergency.

This growing appreciation of the necessity of program building has brought a steadily increasing number of inquiries from cities which are dissatisfied with their programs whether in general or in detail, with requests that studies be made on the ground, with a view to giving a detailed appraisal of the situation and recommendations as to future procedure. One of these cities is Portland, Oregon, which, last year, through representatives of the Portland Council of Social Agencies, presented a request for such a study to various national agency groups in New York. A meeting of representatives of some eleven National agencies was arranged through the services of David Holbrook, Secretary of the National Social Work Council, which resulted in suggestions for the study. It was agreed at this meeting that the Association of Community Chests and Councils because of its approach to community-wide programs might be in the best position to act as the "ball-carrier" in a team to make the study. It was also agreed that various National social work groups would cooperate actively as necessity warranted and developed.

As a result of these and later negotiations, Homer Borst, an Associate Director of the Association of Community Chests and Councils, went to Portland, Oregon, early this year and arranged for a period of study in Portland, covering all fields of social work, including not only Chest agencies but others not in the Chest, and public as well as private organizations, including State-wide agencies, to the extent that they touch the Portland situation. Especial attention is being directed to the question of the division of responsibility between public and private agencies for certain classes of work.

After consultation with representatives of the Child Welfare League of America and Family Welfare Association of America, it was agreed that Miss Catherine Sanders would work on the study team, representing officially the two National organizations named. Miss Sanders left late in January and has been on the work since that time. It was also deemed advisable to have the assistance of C. C. Carstens, Executive Director of the Child Welfare League of America, for a short period on the ground, and Mr. Carstens rendered this service in Portland early in February. This was considered desirable and necessary because of the prominence of the children's program in the Portland scheme of social affairs.

It was also found necessary to have a full time statistician on the job for a period of weeks, and Mrs. Eleanor Carr, of the Springfield, Mass., Chest and Council, was secured for that work.

The study, which is being financed jointly by the Portland Chest, City of Portland, County and State, will be completed early in April. It is being sponsored by a committee of about seventy citizens of Portland of which Elliott R. Corbett is chairman. It is expected that the final report will involve production of at least certain sections for distribution locally.

This study is considered most significant by leaders in various fields of social work, not only because of the factor first mentioned, but also because it continues a policy begun some time ago by National agencies in the fields of work of cooperating in studying a community program of social work to the end that the plans developed may represent the accumulated experience and judgment in a number of fields rather than the necessarily limited interpretation of one individual or agency. These factors, coupled with the intimate relationship between finance and program building implied in such a study, offer interesting possibilities of future development.—RALPH BLANCHARD.

NEW YORK CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY REORGANIZES ITS CHILD-PLACING PROGRAM

An event of nationwide interest to social workers particularly in the children's field, is the recent reorganization of the placement work of the New York Children's Aid Society. The free home work and that of boarding children in private families has been combined in one department, to be known as the Department of Foster Home Care, under the direction of Miss Helen D. Cole, who has for seven years directed the boarding of children for The Children's Aid Society.

For seventy-eight years the Society has placed children in free homes and for adoption all over the country. More than thirty thousand children have been placed

the Child in all, a great number of them in the Middle West, are Assn and the Society points with pride to many successful Catherine and prominent men and women who were placed as representing wards in those frontier homes.

d. Mi Conditions change, however, in seventy-eight years and the Society's policy and methods have changed to fit new conditions. Under the direction of Owen R. Lovejoy, who came to the Society as Executive Secretary three years ago, the organization has ceased to take children except from the metropolitan area and all placement in distant States has been entirely discontinued.

heme (Seven years ago the Society developed a department devoted to the boarding of children in foster homes. In the first year, 1923, this department cared for eighty-seven children. In 1930 the number had increased to 418 children. In the new Department of Foster Home Care over one thousand children will be under care in free, adoption and boarding homes. The headquarters of the department will be at 152 East 45th Street.

sponsor Miss Cole will be assisted by an able staff of about fifty workers and supervisors. Miss Helen Baxter, who expects for nineteen years has assisted Robert N. Brace in the direction of the Free Home and Adoption Department, will supervise the free home work. Miss Dorothy Hutchinson will supervise the boarding of children. Miss Bessie Trout will assist Miss Cole on the acceptance of applications and their allocation to the proper agencies in branch of the department, as well as to supervise such children until ready for placement in foster homes.

plans d An executive board has been formed to be responsible for determining the general policies of the Foster Home Department and for stimulating support of its activities. The committee of laymen and social workers of which Dr. Henry W. Thurston, of the New York School of Social Work, is chairman, will continue to function in an advisory capacity.

CHANGES FOR DIRECTORY

Y REOI NEW YORK—Brooklyn Children's Aid Society. Edward W. Macy succeeds O. T. Lytle, Acting Director. Mr. Macy is to be the Director.

GRAM WISCONSIN—Juvenile Protective Association, Milwaukee. Name changed to Children's Service Association.

combine The ENCLOSURES for March include the following: CHURCH HOME SOCIETY COURIER—73rd Annual Report; REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CHILD WELFARE OF THE BLUE RIDGE INSTITUTE, and the SCHEDULE OF INSTITUTES FOR INSTITUTION WORKERS to be held under the auspices of the Tri-State Conference of orphanage workers.

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

FOR THE FISCAL YEAR JANUARY 1 TO DECEMBER 31, 1930

RECEIPTS		1930	1929
1. Commonwealth Fund.....			\$5,000.00
2. Russell Sage Foundation.....	\$10,000.00		10,000.00
3. Payments for Services.....	4,826.74		2,127.17
4. Dues.....	3,293.75		1,041.25
5. Quotas and Contributions.....	19,862.03		22,228.17
6. Sale of Publications.....	2,121.51		1,819.39
7. Miscellaneous.....	53.89		225.46
8. Surveys.....	11,299.08		16,767.87
TOTAL CURRENT RECEIPTS.....	\$51,457.00		\$59,209.31
9. Non-Support.....	1,050.89		1,047.38
Refunds.....	343.66		933.42
Repaid returned check.....			6.70
Balance on hand first of period.....	815.88		121.75
	\$53,667.43		\$61,318.56
EXPENDITURES			
<i>Salaries—</i>			
1. Service staff.....	\$17,103.99		\$13,948.58
2A. Contingent Fund.....			938.23
3. Clerical staff.....	7,633.21		7,479.74
<i>Office Expense—</i>			
5. Telephone and Telegraph.....	402.46		375.14
6. Stationery, Forms, etc.....	1,111.01		587.72
7. Office Equipment and Renewals.....	510.79		137.89
7A. Postage.....	517.97		517.80
<i>Educational Work—</i>			
8-9-10. Printing.....	2,059.21		3,160.24
11. Library.....	64.46		50.42
<i>Travel and Maintenance—</i>			
12. Regular.....	7,526.99		5,742.01
13A. Post Survey.....	20.90		94.10
<i>Miscellaneous—</i>			
19. Miscellaneous.....	489.00		825.91
<i>Survey Department—</i>			
20. Salaries—Regular.....	6,547.16		10,189.73
21. Salaries—Temporary.....	3,040.00		4,344.76
22. Salaries—Clerical.....	1,554.64		1,488.08
23. Telephone and Telegraph.....	135.90		111.24
24. Stationery, Forms, etc.....	228.82		343.79
25. Travel and Maintenance.....	3,410.04		8,513.32
TOTAL CURRENT EXPENDITURES.....	\$52,356.55		\$58,848.70
Check returned.....			6.70
Non-Support.....	1,050.99		1,047.28
Revolving Fund.....	100.00		600.00
Balance on hand end of period.....	159.89		815.88
	\$53,667.43		\$61,318.56

PAUL T. BEISSER,
Treasurer

(Continued from page 8, column 2)

these situations? Do we honestly believe that the girl who has been accustomed to all the stimuli that modern urban life affords is going to change overnight and develop a powerful interest in ironing shirts or running washing machines or any of those other tasks which require little imagination? Human nature unfortunately does not change that way. "Progress," says Arthur Todd, "is not automatic. It comes, if it comes at all, only through knowledge and effort captured by an all but transcendent sense of direction and a perception of human values."

INTER-CITY CONFERENCE ON ILLEGITIMACY BULLETIN

President: MISS MAUD MORLOCK, Cleveland, Ohio
Vice-President: MISS SABINA MARSHALL, Cleveland, Ohio
Secretary: MISS GRACE REDDING, Cleveland, Ohio
Treasurer: LAWRENCE C. COLE, Cleveland, Ohio

CHANGE OR PROGRESS?

MABEL H. MATTINGLY
 Assistant Professor of Child Welfare,
 Western Reserve University,
 Cleveland, Ohio

In that remarkable series of Letters to a Niece, Baron von Hügel makes constant and varied reference to the fact that "the soul, to grow, needs quiet." By the same token, the case worker, to grow, needs perspective, which involves leisure to think. If the general run of work with the unmarried mother furnishes any criterion of judgment, we are probably safe in concluding that many of us have entirely missed the whole significance of this social phenomenon. We are considering it now in terms of thoroughgoing case work to be handled by an agency with fine standards rather than an isolated problem for a special agency. The work throughout the country shows great increase in numbers, and an equally great vacuum from the standpoint of literature on the subject. Are we to continue with the sterile excuse of lack of time and heavy case loads? Should we not, on the other hand, humbly strike our breasts and utter our mea culpa on the basis of our own lack of a sense of human values? If ever there is a redistribution of gifts to humankind, may all social workers be blessed with a sixth sense,—the *historical* sense. This might increase our area of sensitivity towards what has gone before and keep us ever conscious of modern trends, in the light of newer insight into changing social relations. Generally speaking, there is probably no area of case work which has been so infected with the microbe of mediocrity as the work with the unmarried mother. Here and there throughout the country there are rare and inspiring exceptions. These serve, however, only to bring out, in fuller relief, the work that is less worthy.

Are we making the mistake of confusing change with progress, either by taking progress for granted, or assuming it as inevitable? We go about our cases day by day. We sit in conferences, year by year; and (if it isn't too late in the afternoon) we occasionally nod intelligently; but have we ourselves done any real vitalized thinking or caused anyone else to do so because of our leadership? Even among the group that comes more closely in touch with the case worker than any other, namely, those in charge of maternity homes,

has there been material progress in thinking? Is there not still a very large group who consider the problem a "shush" affair; who see no treatment for the child born out of wedlock except to be placed in adoption who conceive of no process of re-education for the unmarried mother except "to live down her shame" mostly without help or encouragement of any kind from any source? The strands of these social concepts are firmly interwoven in the thinking of the community. Memory patterns, based perhaps on a single instance carried over a long period give added significance to this type of thinking. The answer may lie partly in a better type of case work by those thoroughly competent to interpret their processes in a thoroughly dynamic way. It may also lie partly in a better trained personnel in maternity homes. It surely does lie to a large degree in Boards of Directors of maternity homes, who are responsible, in the final analysis, for the quality of the social fabric that goes into the community make-up.

Let me not be misunderstood—I refer to the type of training that is concerned with the values it offers rather than the bestowal of immediate results, and that species of education which kills the spirit and suppresses matter. Merely discussing training will never bestow it. The wider opportunity presented by the demands not only a personal fidelity of no small proportion, but a consciousness of one's own limitations, a complete willingness to forego old securities, and an abiding respect for the pattern of others. The case worker should not carry the whole load. From the community standpoint, educators, medical men, clergymen and laymen generally ought to have a common loyalty to the common task of better legislation and improved court procedure.

There is one point that seems to deserve special emphasis. If we concede that a large part of our work is taken up with adults of childhood mentality who stand alone with difficulty, and then only for a short period of time, are the maternity homes developing programs in keeping with this need? Are they conscious of the fact that these unmarried mothers have often engaged in illicit sex relations because of frustrations in other fields of human activity and because they may have looked forth while because of a companion picked up at the dance hall, the rink, or some other place of amusement and who for the time being satisfied an emotional need that was none too clearly defined? Are the maternity homes sufficiently aware of all the factors that enter into the problem before they attempt treatment on the superficial level of reform?

Have case workers been able to bring about a change in institution regime because of their knowledge of inner mental conflicts as a causative factor in some

(Continued on page 7, column 2)